

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/603,382 | 06/24/2003 | Massimo Civilini | 2705-728 | 2846 | |
| | 7590 09/18/2007 | n C | EXAMINER | | |
| 210 SW MORR | NSON & MCCOLLOM, JISON STREET, SUITE 4 | | | | |
| PORTLAND, O | OR 97204 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 09/18/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | • | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>.</u> | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Intonvious Summans | 10/603,382 | CIVILINI, MASSIMO | | | | |
| Interview Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Janet Suglo | 2857 | | | | |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO | personnel): | | | | | |
| (1) <u>Janet Suglo</u> . | (3) Michael Cofield (Reg. N | <i>lo. 54,630)</i> . | | | | |
| (2) <u>Jeffrey West</u> . | (4) | | | | | |
| Date of Interview: <u>06 September 2007</u> . | | | | | | |
| Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2 | 2) applicant's representative | e] | | | | |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: | e) No. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,14,22 and 27</u> . | | | | | | |
| Identification of prior art discussed: Quist et al. (US Patent 6,199,018). | | | | | | |
| Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. | ı)⊠ was not reached. h)☐ N | 1/ A. | | | | |
| Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant submitted amendments to claims based on the interview held August 23, 2007. Applicant argued that Quist teaches the MTBF as an input and not as an output of the system and further that Quist does not teach an output of a rate or MTBF. Applicant further argued that expected life as taught by Quist is not equivalent to a failure rate. Examiner agreed to reconsider Quist. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE | | | | | | |
| INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INT FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTE requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. | e last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, | been filed, APP Y DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS | LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examsnul - AV 2857
Examiner's signature, if required

JEFFREY R WEST